Toward the conclusion of the article Dr. Campbell objects to the fact that the testimony of his servant boy and his professional colleagues, Drs. Lizars and Adams (the latter of whom had, with Drs. Campbell and Hall, certified Mary insane) is ignored in favour of that of the nurses at the Asylum. The writer does not object that Dr. Campbell's own servant would scarcely have been a free and impartial witness, that his own colleagues would, for different reasons, have been biased, and that one of these colleagues, as one of the three examiners who certified Mary insane, would virtually have been corroborating his own testimony.

It is not surprising that this writer finds the jury's statement to the Coroner, expressing their sense of Dr. Campbell's "highly improper medical treatment" of Mary, utterly inappropriate. A quotation from the Globe of May 9 indicates that the editors of that paper view the jury's comments as the imprudent and impudent intervention of ignorant laymen into what was essentially a matter of disagreement between professionals, based on differences between rival schools of medicine: "who but a born fool would pronounce an opinion on one medical man, on the faith of statements made by others of a rival school?" (3).

Dr. Campbell's letter to the "Telegraph" of May 13,1868

Dr. Campbell prefaces his letter by expressing one of the great conventions of prefatory writing, the sense of satiety, and that he therefore adds something more only out of a conviction of his good reason: "Enough, and most people will probably think, far more than enough, has already been given to the public on this painful and delicate topic" (4). This reason is not his own reputation, which he scorns to defend from "the criticism of a coroner's jury" (4), but the reputation of his son, "a young man now preparing himself for the medical profession" (4). Not surprisingly, Dr. Campbell immediately indicates his concern for himself, by objecting to the charge, if not of having performed an abortion, then of having committed what he should have known probably amounted to one: "a farther and most calumnious charge against myself, of having used improper means to bring on menstruation in a case of Amenorrhoea [sic], where you say there was a possibility of pregnancy existing" (4). Dr. Campbell insists that the charge is false, mainly because he had never treated Mary for Amenorrhoea (suppression of the menstrual discharge), but for Dysmemorrhoea (painful or difficult menstruation).